# NORTHEAST LAND SURVEYS

5461 Cedar Lake Road – Oscoda, Mi 48750
E-Mail: nelandsurvey@sbcglobal.net
Bill Woods, Professional Surveyor
Phone 989-739-0771 – Fax 989-739-0772



To: Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12 St. SW
Washington, DC 20554

Re: LightSquared Subsidiary, LLC
Ex Parte Communication, IB Docket No. 11-109
IBSF File No. SAT-MOD-20101118-00239

Dear Marlene;

I've been periodically following the LightSquared vs. GPS issue since sometime last summer and, quite frankly, I didn't pay much attention because I didn't even consider it to be plausible that the FCC would permit LightSquared to interfere with the existing satellite-reserved frequency band(s), especially the GPS signal. I figured at a minimum, even if the FCC was willing to ignore their own regulations or the good of the population in general, that the military would simply squash any chance for GPS interference. Apparently and perplexingly, it has not been so simple, so I find it necessary to voice my objections to allowing anyone to degrade such a well-established and necessary tool as GPS.

I am a Licensed Professional Surveyor trying to struggle through the current economy. (Insert information about your situation.) I have an investment in very expensive equipment including high-precision GPS, which costs between $10,000 to $50,000or more depending on the needs, application and age. In addition to the enormous costs for high precision GPS equipment, the poor economy has brought project prices down to unreasonable lows so it is very difficult to be able to actually make any money on a given project, even with the current GPS signal.

I find it appalling that the FCC would even consider putting the GPS signal at risk, even minimally, by allowing anyone to construct a terrestrial system of signal-depreciating or jamming structures, with portable signal jammers soon to be in the hands of a significant portion of the nation's population. The current GPS signal enables the high-precision equipment to be used in most cases where minimal obstructions exist (trees, buildings, etc.), but even now it can be difficult to get an adequate signal for the necessary accuracy required in land surveying, in some situations it just barely works.

LightSquared's proposed solution of just adding +/- $10 filters to existing equipment is absurd. Not only does adding a filter to high-precision equipment require countless hours of expensive technical work that I cannot and every existing user should not pay for, it reduces the strength of the already small signal that the antenna actually receives.

LightSquared's accusation that the GPS industry should have previously filtered out the subject frequencies is not only impossible in some cases, but ridiculous, since those

frequencies adjacent to GPS have been and should remain reserved for similar and potentially user-applicable satellite signals, which are completely compatible.
Getting a sufficient signal to place your car on the street is not the same as trying to measure a property corner monument with millimeter accuracy. Having even a minute signal loss in those situations would make the GPS unusable, causing the necessity for backtracking and using manual terrestrial equipment, resulting in countless hours/days of work to be done where it was not expected to be necessary. When projects are billed with thin profit margins, this can be extremely detrimental to any company. Even if those unexpected costs can be recovered by the surveying company, the project itself becomes more costly, making the difference between whether a project is feasible or not. Even in a healthy economy, the additional expense would be detrimental to every industry, consumer and government agency affected by the increased cost of collecting and/or providing survey data, including GIS. Since most surveyors have and use this same type of high-precision GPS equipment, I'm sure that all would agree that any signal loss is completely unacceptable.
The simple fact that the proposed terrestrial usage of the satellite-reserved frequencies by LightSquared has been proven to disrupt or adversely affect so many established industries, emergency response organizations, consumers, and the population in general should make it very simple to deny their request. The obvious solution is for LightSquared to use a different frequency reserved for terrestrial, not satellite usage.
Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

Bill Woods P. S. #25882